

Serial No. 09/625,889  
Page 6

### **REMARKS**

This response is intended as a full and complete response to the final Office Action mailed on June 30, 2005. In the Office Action, the Examiner notes that claims 1-15 are pending and rejected. By this response, claims 1-9 and 12-15 are amended. Claims 10-12 continue unamended. No new matter has been entered.

In view of the following discussion, Applicant submits that all of the claims now pending in the application are non-anticipated and non-obvious under the respective provisions of 35 U.S.C. §§102 and 103. Thus, Applicant believes that all of these claims are now in allowable form.

It is to be understood that Applicant does not acquiesce to the Examiner's characterizations of the art of record or to Applicant's subject matter recited in the pending claims. Furthermore, the Applicant is not acquiescing to the Examiner's statements as to the applicability of the art of record to the pending claims.

### **REJECTIONS**

#### **A. 35 U.S.C. §102**

##### **Claims 1, 5, 9, 11 and 12**

The Examiner has rejected claims 1, 5, 9, 11 and 12 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Lauer et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,118,936, issued Sep. 12, 2000, hereinafter "Lauer "). The rejection is respectfully traversed.

In general, Lauer discloses a signaling network management system for collecting network topology, traffic, performance, and fault information, and for correlating that information and displaying the information to system operators. (Lauer, Abstract). In particular, Lauer discloses that at least one of the windows displayed to the system operators "...presents a list of IEC voice trunks, connected to a specified IEC switch, and the LEC end office switches or other IEC switched where they terminate." (Lauer, Col. 14, Lines 44-47).

379139-1

Serial No. 09/625,889

Page 7

Applicant maintains, however, that Lauer fails to disclose each and every element of the claimed invention, as arranged in the claim. Specifically, Applicant maintains that Lauer does not teach or suggest the limitations of "identifying a first managed portion of the circuit proximate the non-managed portion of the circuit, identifying a second managed portion of the circuit proximate the non-managed portion of the circuit, and providing a link between the first managed portion of the circuit and the second managed portion of the circuit, the link adapted for being characterized as a managed entity by a management system." Specifically, Applicant's invention, as defined in claim 1 (and similarly in claims 5, 9, and 12), recites:

"A method for managing adjunct access for a circuit in a network management system, the method comprising the step of:  
identifying a non-managed portion of a circuit;  
identifying a first managed portion of the circuit proximate the non-managed portion of the circuit;  
identifying a second managed portion of the circuit proximate the non-managed portion of the circuit; and  
providing a link between the first managed portion of the circuit and the second managed portion of the circuit, the link adapted for being characterized as a managed entity by a management system."  
[Emphasis added.]

In contrast to Applicant's invention, Lauer teaches a network in which the entire network topology is known and, therefore, all portions of associated circuits are known and therefore managed. In particular, Lauer teaches management of an interface between an IEC network and a non-IEC (i.e., a LEC) network. Lauer teaches the use of a cluster view of the IEC signaling network (displaying IEC nodes as well as non-IEC nodes) for performing failure isolation processing to determine the source of a network failure, as well the potential impact of the network failure. Thus, the display of both IEC nodes and non-IEC nodes actually teaches management of all portions of a network such that there are no non-managed network portions. As such, in the disclosure of Lauer presented above,

Serial No. 09/625,889  
Page 8

Lauer specifically recites a lack of the ability of the Lauer system to identify a non-managed portion of a circuit, as claimed by the Applicant in at least claim 1.

Furthermore, even if the IEC and non-IEC network portions taught in Lauer constitute managed and non-managed portions of a circuit, respectively, Lauer is still completely devoid of any teaching or suggestion of a second managed portion of the circuit. In the Applicant's invention of at least claim 1, on the other hand, first and second managed portions of a circuit that are both proximate a non-managed portion of the circuit are identified. Furthermore, as taught in Applicant's invention of at least claim 1, a link is provided between first and second managed portions, where the link is adapted for being characterized as a managed entity representative of the non-managed portion of the circuit. As such, since Lauer fails to teach or suggest identifying a second managed portion of a circuit, Lauer does not teach each and every element of Applicant's invention of at least claim 1.

Moreover, as cited by the Examiner, Lauer teaches the use of linksets to represent numerous physical links that may be provisioned between the IEC nodes and non-IEC nodes. The linksets, however, do not represent a non-managed portion of a circuit proximate first and second managed portions of the circuit, as taught in Applicant's invention of at least claim 1. Rather, Lauer teaches that the linksets merely represent links, where information associated with the represented physical links may be used for isolating network failures. In particular, the linksets as taught in Lauer comprise displayable links representative of physical links in the network. Thus, linksets taught in Lauer merely represent groups of physical links between IEC nodes and non-IEC nodes. The use of a linkset to represent physical links between IEC nodes and non-IEC nodes, as taught in Lauer, is simply not use of a manageable entity (i.e., a link) to represent a non-managed portion of a circuit that is proximate two managed portions of the circuit, as taught in Applicant's invention of at least claim 1.

In fact, in the Office Action, the Examiner specifically states that "[t]he instructions cause the processor to determine whether a non-managed portion

Serial No. 09/625,889  
Page 9

(non-IEC node) of a circuit exists, and to provide a link (a linkset) between non-managed portions of the circuit and proximate managed portions (IEC nodes) of the circuit." (Office Action, Page 3). Thus, assuming that the non-IEC nodes constitute a non-managed portion of a circuit, it is clear that Lauer merely teaches providing a linkset between a non-managed portion of a circuit and a managed portion of the circuit. Nowhere in Lauer is there any teaching or suggestion of a second managed portion of the circuit. Furthermore, nowhere in Lauer is there any teaching or suggestion of providing a link between a first managed portion of a circuit and a second managed portion of a circuit where the first and second managed portions of the circuit are proximate a non-managed portion of the circuit, as taught in Applicant's invention of at least claim 1.

Thus, Lauer merely teaches an IEC-to-non-IEC interface (i.e., an interface between a network element in a managed portion of the network and a network element in a non-managed portion of the network). Lauer is completely devoid of first and second managed portions of a circuit proximate a non-managed portion of the circuit. Thus, Lauer must also be completely devoid of any teaching or suggestion of at least the limitations of identifying the first and second managed portions of the circuit that are proximate the non-managed portion of the circuit. Similarly, Lauer must also be completely devoid of any teaching or suggestion of providing a link between the first managed portion of the circuit and the second managed portion of the circuit. Therefore, Lauer fails to teach each and every element of Applicant's invention of at least claim 1.

"Anticipation requires the presence in a single prior art reference disclosure of each and every element of the claimed invention, arranged as in the claim" (Lindemann Maschinenfabrik GmbH v. American Hoist & Derrick Co., 730 F.2d 1452, 221 U.S.P.Q. 481, 485 (Fed. Cir. 1984) (citing Connell v. Sears, Roebuck & Co., 722 F.2d 1542, 220 U.S.P.Q. 193 (Fed. Cir. 1983)) (emphasis added). As such, for at least the reasons stated above, Applicant respectfully submits that Lauer fails to teach each and every element of the claimed invention, as arranged in the claim, and as such fails to anticipate the invention of Applicant.

379139-1

Serial No. 09/625,889  
Page 10

Thus, Applicant submits that independent claim 1 is not anticipated by the teachings of Lauer and, as such, fully satisfies the requirements of 35 U.S.C. §102 and is patentable thereunder. Similarly, independent claims 5, 9 and 12 recite relevant features similar to the feature recited in independent claim 1. As such, the Applicant submits that independent claims 5, 9 and 12 are also not anticipated by the teachings of Lauer and, as such, fully satisfy the requirements of 35 U.S.C. §102 and are patentable thereunder.

Furthermore, dependent claim 11 depends directly from independent claim 9 and recites additional features therefor. As such, and for at least the reasons set forth herein, Applicant submits that dependent claim 11 is also not anticipated by the teachings of Lauer. Therefore, the Applicant submits that dependent claim 11 also fully satisfies the requirements of 35 U.S.C. §102 and is patentable thereunder.

**B. 35 U.S.C. §103**

**Claims 2-4, 6-8, 10 and 13-15**

The Examiner rejected claims 2-4, 6-8, 10 and 13-15 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Lauer in view of Dodd (Annabel Z. Dodd, "The Essential Guide to Telecommunications," 1998, pp. 144-145). The rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claims 2-4, 6-8, 10 and 13-15 depend from independent claims 1, 5, 9, and 12 and recite additional features therefor. As described above, Lauer fails to teach or suggest Applicant's invention as recited in independent claims 1, 5, 9, and 12. In particular, Lauer fails to teach or suggest at least the limitations of "identifying a first managed portion of the circuit proximate the non-managed portion of the circuit, identifying a second managed portion of the circuit proximate the non-managed portion of the circuit, and providing a link between the first managed portion of the circuit and the second managed portion of the circuit, the link adapted for being characterized as a managed entity by a management system."

379139-1

Serial No. 09/625,889  
Page 11

Therefore, at least because the teachings of Lauer do not teach, show, or suggest Applicant's invention of independent claims 1, 5, 9 and 12, Applicant respectfully submits that the teachings of Lauer also do not teach or suggest Applicant's invention of claims 2-4, 6-8, 10 and 13-15, which depend either directly or indirectly from Applicant's independent claims 1, 5, 9 and 12 and recite additional limitations therefor. Furthermore, Dodd fails to bridge the substantial gap between Lauer and Applicant's invention.

The Examiner relies upon Dodd for showing the limitations of dependent claims 2-4, 6-8, 10, and 13-15. In general, Dodd discloses various network management techniques. In particular, the portions of Dodd relied upon by the Examiner specifically teach that "[t]he topology of the operations network must be carefully designed to avoid the situation in which most or all management traffic passes through a single network element, thereby creating a bottleneck." (Dodd, pg 144-145). As such, Dodd merely teaches various network topology designs for routing network management traffic between the network and associated management systems.

Nowhere in Dodd, however, is there any teaching or suggestion of at least the limitations of "identifying a first managed portion of the circuit proximate the non-managed portion of the circuit, identifying a second managed portion of the circuit proximate the non-managed portion of the circuit, and providing a link between the first managed portion of the circuit and the second managed portion of the circuit, the link adapted for being characterized as a managed entity by a management system," as taught by Applicant's specification and claimed in at least Applicant's independent claim 1.

As such, Applicant submits that independent claim 1 is not rendered obvious by the teachings of Lauer and Dodd, either singly or in combination. Thus, the Applicant respectfully submits that independent claim 1 fully satisfies the requirements of 35 U.S.C. §103 and is patentable thereunder. Similarly, independent claims 5, 9 and 12 recite relevant features similar to the features recited in independent claim 1. As such, Applicant submits that independent

378139-1

Serial No. 09/625,889

Page 12

claims 5, 9 and 12 are also not rendered obvious by the teachings of Lauer and Dodd and, as such, fully satisfy the requirements of 35 U.S.C. §103 and are patentable thereunder.

Furthermore, claims 2-4, 6-8, 10 and 13-15 depend, either directly or indirectly, from independent claims 1, 5, 9, and 12 and recite additional features therefor. Since the combination of Lauer and Dodd does not render obvious Applicant's invention as recited in claims 1, 5, 9, and 12, Applicant submits that dependent claims 2-4, 6-8, 10 and 13-15 are also not obvious and fully satisfy the requirements under 35 U.S.C. §103 and are patentable thereunder.

Serial No. 09/625,889  
Page 13

### CONCLUSION

Thus, Applicant submits that none of the claims presently in the application are anticipated under the provisions of 35 U.S.C. § 102 or obvious under the provisions of 35 U.S.C. § 103. Consequently, Applicant believes that all these claims are presently in condition for allowance. Accordingly, both reconsideration of this application and its swift passage to issue are earnestly solicited.

If, however, the Examiner believes that there are any unresolved issues requiring adverse action in any of the claims now pending in the application, it is requested that the Examiner telephone Mr. Eamon J. Wall at (732) 530-9404 so that appropriate arrangements can be made for resolving such issues as expeditiously as possible.

Respectfully submitted,

7/29/05



Eamon J. Wall  
Reg. No. 39,414  
(732) 530-9404

Moser Patterson & SHERIDAN, LLP  
595 Shrewsbury Avenue, Suite 100  
Shrewsbury, New Jersey 07702  
732-530-9404 - Telephone  
732-530-9808 - Facsimile